



University of
St Andrews | FOUNDED
1413 |

RCUK Policy on Open Access

**Call for Evidence Report to Research Councils UK for
the period 1 April 2013 to 31 July 2014 from the
University of St Andrews**

1. In this report we provide evidence of the effectiveness and impact of the RCUK policy with regard to our main role as an HEI. We make some comments on the effect of the policy on different disciplines, and provide some detailed observations on the internal processes within our institution and the practicalities of administering the RCUK block grant. We also comment on the cost of OA publishing. Some associated data is presented in the Appendices section.
2. Awareness and compliance with the policy is by no means 100%, but it has energised debate about OA and the potential benefits. Authors are still generally anti-Gold OA in hybrid journals as they are concerned about the perceived high costs of APCs (especially combined with ongoing subscription charges) and this becomes a negative factor in encouraging them to make their publications OA. The 'hands-off' approach in the policy (ie leaving decisions to author and institution) leads to the publishers taking control of how authors understand and make OA choices. There is a groundswell of support for Green OA, but in reality the Green route is often not followed through by authors. Despite compliance requirements there are still some researchers who do not see the value of OA or are concerned about having their choice of journal (especially if non-UK) compromised. We are also aware of resistance to using 'research' money for OA purposes.
3. We have not seen any examples of RCUK-funded authors choosing a different journal to achieve compliance or choosing a compliant over a non-compliant journal. Publishing decisions have continued to be based on the optimum choice of journal rather than on compliance with the policy.
4. At the start of the block grant period, there were concerns about the funds running out, how funding would be prioritised, and fears that some authors would be disadvantaged if this were to happen.
5. However the encouragement in the policy for immediate Gold OA does fit the wishes of some researchers and they will often make repeated use of the fund. The availability of central funds has definitely created interest among authors in exploring OA options and has created a bridging point between Library support staff and researchers. The central fund also satisfies researchers who are wary of the format quality of Accepted Manuscripts and who therefore prefer the Gold route.
6. On the whole, Gold OA transactions recorded against the block grant have been initiated by authors themselves, though this is usually prompted by notifications from a publisher. Green transactions have sometimes resulted from initial requests for APC funding, but a substantial percentage has been achieved by proactive requests from Library staff. Self-archiving is still not an established part of the publishing workflow, and there are inevitably some authors who see OA compliance as a burden rather than a standard part of the publication process.
7. A very positive development is that a subset of RCUK-funded researchers are now looking for support during the publication process rather than making decisions about OA in isolation. One-to-one engagement with academics is time-consuming but productive.
8. The policy does encourage proper funder acknowledgment in publications and better records in our institutional research information system, PURE. In this regard the policy has paved the way for the new Hefce REF policy on OA even though the policies differ in detail.
9. We have worked predominantly with science disciplines because this is where the majority of RCUK funding sits within our institution. We note below some disciplinary differences with regard to licensing.

10. Funds for the period April 2013 to July 2014 have been managed by the Library. Reports on the fund are made to an OA Steering Group and to the University Research Forum (Directors of Research from the University's 18 Schools and staff from relevant central units).
11. The possibility of allocating funds across Schools was discounted as being too complex both to administer and in the calculation of allocations. Funds are allocated on a first-come basis with a proviso to review this approach once a threshold of 75% has been reached. Spend was initially very low, which we attributed to a decline in publication following the 2014 REF census period. If funds had become very limited the contingency was to encourage Green OA as a default no-cost solution. In reality the threshold was not reached until very late in the funding cycle. The operation of a central fund meant we could take advantage of memberships and pre-pay deals to enable discounts and streamlined processes. We also took part in the Jisc APC pilot project and transferred funds to the service; however the initial project did not deliver the expected benefits, and so we withdrew funds back into our block grant. We welcome the development of the follow-on Jisc Monitor project and are contributing to it.
12. Although we did not use funds from this block grant for staffing, we are committed to using funds from the 2014 grant onwards to support at least two full-time support posts. We regard this as essential infrastructure and we could not administer the policy and provide adequate support without it. One staff post was already in place, initially funded from our pump-priming BIS grant.
13. The mechanism for authors to make requests on the fund is to email our generic OA support account with details including journal, article title, manuscript ID or DOI, funder name and grant ID, and to confirm that they do not have existing funds available for APCs.
14. We are building up a model of how we allocate, administer, monitor and report on the funds. We carried out a Lean (efficiency review) exercise to assess and develop our strategies for communication and support both to authors and to other related central units, especially our Finance Office and grant administrative services. A major outcome of this is to develop a combined approach for the RCUK and Hefce OA policies.
15. Our OA Steering Group assists with dissemination, and has recently been expanded to include a number of academic and administrative colleagues. Our work on dissemination can be demonstrated by the fact that RCUK compliance stood at 46% in February 2014, 55% in July 2014, and now 71%. Overall OA is also climbing steadily, to 42% for 2014 publications (from around 23% initially).
16. We would emphasize the major resource implications of supporting the RCUK policy. The parties with the fewest resources - ie researchers and support staff in institutions - are doing the majority of the work, and there does not seem to be an equal burden being shared by the publishers - where most of the development, certainly in hybrid journals, appears to be in taking advantage of new sources of income.
17. The pain points are numerous and the administrative burden is very heavy, largely due to the complexities of publisher processes and the high level of support required by authors. Making complex OA choices is a completely new aspect of publishing for many authors. Infrastructure and interoperable workflows for exchange and reuse of data are badly needed. Work is being done within institutions, but we generally have a patchy picture of the data needed for transactions and reporting. There is a lack of granularity in publisher systems and institutional finance systems for recording article-level data. Systems are not always able to be joined-up to

- allow efficient flows of data. We need publishers to do much more work to support this, as well as suppliers of repository and CRIS systems. Consistency and standards are crucial to progress.
18. See Appendix B for itemised and average APC costs. We note that average APCs for fully OA journals are lower. The average APC in hybrid journals would be even higher if we did not do substantial work to seek value for money by evaluating and taking part in publisher discount schemes. However these schemes are varied, difficult to compare, and require advance deposits of funds which often roll across grant years.
 19. Open publication of APC costs should be encouraged to exert pressure on pricing of APCs and offsetting of journal subscriptions.
 20. Considering the higher APCs for hybrid journals, perhaps only 'pure' Gold OA should be funded by the policy to get best value for money unless publishers have satisfactory subscription offset policies in place. While pre-pay deals are valuable to offset publisher APC costs, it does mean that significant amounts of money are committed to publishers and the deals are restricted to RCUK-funded authors. The central fund makes it easier to manage publication costs after the end of individual research grants. Previously, funds had to be found from School budgets or by individuals.
 21. It would be useful to have greater clarity and guidance on the use of the grant for expenses other than direct APC costs, such as staffing, systems infrastructure, training and collaborative projects. Clarity is still needed on the use of the block grants for page charges, and the guidance is currently very open to interpretation. This could result in a sense of unfairness if decisions vary between institutions, and does not provide any incentive for publishers to abolish page charges.
 22. The use the block grant for staffing is extremely valuable; however it would be helpful if the grant infrastructure could facilitate staff contracts over multi-year periods, so that institutions could build upon existing staff skills over time.
 23. Embargo policies were simpler before the arrival of funder polices. They are now more complex and numerous with separate embargo requirements depending on whether research is funded or not, and whether deposit is 'mandated' or not, causing much confusion for authors. Publisher embargo polices would benefit (as would other aspects of scholarly journal publisher pricing and practice) from statutory regulation. See Appendix E for examples.
 24. There has been general acceptance of CC-BY licences by the disciplines we have worked with, and for the most part authors are happy to be directed to the compliant licence rather than being offered confusing multiple options. Computer Science authors were generally anti CC-BY and wanted to add Non-Commercial or Share-Alike options. We have little experience of Arts and Humanities disciplines in direct relation to the RCUK requirement; however general experience with these disciplines suggests they will want Non-Commercial and No-Derivatives in their licensing. Across all disciplines there is a lack of awareness about licences, copyright transfer and publisher agreements, and the majority of authors do not analyse these. Unfortunately, we expect the non-alignment of RCUK OA policies with the new Hefce OA policy in the area of licences to create more confusion for authors.
 25. We have used a mixed approach to communicate the RCUK policy. Information has been sent out from the Office of the Vice Principal for Research and from our Research Policy Office, primarily to Heads of Schools and Directors of Research. The Library emailed all PIs on RCUK grants and sent information to key staff in Schools. The Library provided presentations and documentation, and we have carried out School visits and workshops, and individual face-to-

- face sessions. Experience shows that communication needs to be repeated constantly to deliver the messages about compliance and the policy.
26. We plan to target specific Schools and disciplines and do a concentrated awareness and support campaign to communicate both the RCUK and Hefce policies together. We believe that a very simple message is needed - but this will be challenging unless there is consistency of policies.
 27. The effectiveness and strength of this message would be helped by repeated communication from funders too. We would suggest a review of how the policies (including updates and FAQs) are communicated to institutions. Some information is only communicated at workshops, by word of mouth or mailing lists. Perhaps there should be a key contacts mailing list or forum where particular questions could be addressed.
 28. We provide evidence here for most of the types requested, with further data in the Appendices and in the *Compliance Data Report* for St Andrews.
 - The total number of RCUK-funded research papers provided in our Compliance Report is **285**
 - Papers that have been made OA via the Gold route: **73**
 - Papers that have been made OA via the Green route: **130**
 - (Papers not yet made OA: **82**)
 - Our percentage compliance is therefore: **71%**
 29. See Appendix A for a financial spend report. See the APC data at <http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1150253> or an extract in Appendix B for all our centrally-managed APC transactions which can be analysed by journal. See Appendix C for examples of other publication charges.
 30. We have seen examples of specified licences being paid for but not implemented, and these have needed to be repeatedly chased to see if they have been implemented by publishers. See Appendix D for examples. We are not aware of any issues with regard to reproducing third party material. Authors have exercised their own choice to publish in their first-choice journal regardless of licence issues.
 31. See Appendix E for examples of issues with embargo periods.
 32. There are numerous examples of difficulties understanding the compliance options provided by journals. See Appendices C, D and E. Non-alignment of funder policies within the RCUK funders themselves causes problems. For example a corresponding author may comply with eg BBSRC but not with a co-author's MRC requirement. Other grey areas include travel/equipment grants, and also instances in which external grants are associated with co-authored publications.
 33. We have concentrated our spend primarily on APCs using established criteria for claims on the grant, and in the future will also use the grant for support staffing. There is a lack of clarity about the inclusion of page charges. We foresee problems if publishers continue to expand and elaborate on publication charges and start to introduce variations on and additions to what we originally understood to be one all-encompassing APC payment - eg extra charges for licences.
 34. When funding publisher membership deals from the RCUK Block Grant, it is extremely difficult to ensure only RCUK-funded papers are covered.
 35. Examples of issues with APC payments are provided in Appendix C. There is a multiplicity of publisher interfaces, workflows and choices for authors, and confusing terminology with regard to payment and licensing options. It is very difficult for central support staff, administering the funds and payments, to get access to all stages of the process or see the questions and options presented to the authors. We are frequently faced with supporting unknown or constantly changing publisher processes.

36. We have included 'health check' sections in the Appendices to illustrate difficulties with obtaining data. One particular area of difficulty is capturing complete and accurate information about all the publications which arise from Research Council-funded research. We believe that using our internal Research Information System (PURE) is the most accurate figure we could provide, as it allows direct linking between a publication and a specific grant. We do not count papers if the grant cannot be identified (eg a minor reference to RCUK-funded equipment) or does not exist in PURE (eg Doctoral Training Grants). External sources such as *Web of Science* are not reliable as funding acknowledgements are often inexact and reports would incorrectly include papers with grants relating to external authors.
37. We have counted payment of an APC as compliant for the Gold route, and existence of full-text in our repository as compliant for Green. There may be fine detail in this on exact licensing or embargo periods that we cannot report on comprehensively, but we provide examples in the table 'Non-compliant licences' in Appendix D.
38. We would suggest that the reporting of OA outcomes and compliance should be reviewed. Specific elements of the reporting requirement for institutions could be clarified and expanded. Researchers perceive the RCUK policy as a very low 'mandate' as it is unclear what the reporting requirement for OA will be in ResearchFish and there seems to be no likelihood of sanctions. It would be helpful to have a roadmap for future reporting, so that effective systems can be put in place.
39. It would be useful for RCUK to open discussions on authors giving a non-exclusive licence to their institutions to allow for hosting in a repository (ie the Harvard model - <https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/authors/amend>). This could be explored and discussed at a high level between RCUK, the Funding Councils and HE institutions, and would potentially make Green OA immediate, at the same time removing the need for complex interaction with publishers over both current Gold OA licensing issues and Green embargo periods.
40. It is important to note that in the vast majority of cases, it is not possible to provide a licence for Green OA papers. Manuscripts are usually deposited only after copyright has been transferred to a publisher, and so the ability to apply a licence does not lie with authors or institutions. Publisher policies generally provide permission to deposit but no rights to apply any specific licence.
41. We have a challenge ahead fitting together funder compliance with the requirements of the new Hefce policy on OA for the next REF. The RCUK and Hefce policies are based on fundamentally different philosophies - and crucially one is funded (Gold emphasis) while the other is not (Green emphasis). There are also differences in licensing requirements, timing of OA activity (eg the Hefce policy pushes the process back to point of acceptance for publication), and detail about embargo periods and compliant journals. This confuses researchers, creates more support needs and gives publishers more opportunity to cost up more varied and complex OA options. We hope that RCUK and Hefce continue to discuss and develop aligned policies.

Declaration of interests

The University Librarian, John MacColl, is Vice-Chair of Research Libraries UK.

John MacColl, Janet Aucock & Jackie Proven. September 2014.

Appendix A: Financial Spend

RCUK BLOCK GRANT 1 April 2013 - 31 July 2014			
Block grant	£203,593.00		
Section A: Expenditure by Publisher			
Publisher	Total amount	Number of articles	Comments
American Chemical Society	£6,144.47	5	Includes 3 author memberships to enable significant APC discount
Association for Computing Machinery	£800.00	1	
Association for Research in Vision and Ophthalmology	£735.00	1	
BioMed Central	£6,569.00	6	Prepay membership deal
Elsevier	£20,270.00	14	Prepay deal (awaiting 2 further to meet minimum under deal)
Elsevier	£1,576.29	1	
Geological Society of America	£3,329.91	2	
National Academy of Sciences (PNAS)	£649.45	1	
Nature Publishing Group	£11,340.00	3	Paid via Jisc APC
The Optical Society (OSA)	£1,377.76	2	
Oxford University Press	£3,444.00	3	
Oxford University Press	£2,875.20	n/a	Annual membership to enable discount for Nucleic Acids Research
PLOS	£2,051.09	2	
Royal Society	£7,920.00	6	
Royal Society	£4,200.00	n/a	Annual membership to enable discount for all RSP journals
Royal Society of Chemistry	£0.00	5	Free Gold4Gold credits
Royal Society of Chemistry	£4,320.00	3	Prepay APCs
Royal Society of Chemistry	£31,680.00	n/a	Prepay deal continuing to end 2015, 22 APC credits remaining
Taylor & Francis	£2,158.54	1	
Wiley	£21,938.00	17	Prepay membership deal used
Wiley	£24,562.00	n/a	Prepay amount unused
TOTAL	£157,940.71	73	

Section B: Other expenditure analysis			
Expenditure to achieve OA	Amount	Articles	Description
Jisc APC	£47,991.67	n/a	Deposit for APC pilot (returned end July)
Sub-total paid to publishers	£157,940.71		
Sub-total of other expenditure	£47,991.67		
TOTAL	£205,932.38		
Balance of block grant remaining	-£2,339.38		Covered by Jisc APC refund

Appendix B: Gold Item Transactions and APCs

Note: This is an extract of the APC data published at <http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1150253>

APCs	GBP amounts may not match exactly to amounts reported to funders due to currency exchange, shared costs, discounts, prepay deals, VAT, bank charges or additional factors
Paid date	Date approved by Library, may not match date received by publisher
OA date	Date confirmed by Library, may not match publication date
RCUK Fund	RCUK transactions may include membership fees and other charges associated with APCs. Reporting period Apr 2013-July 2014
WT Fund	Wellcome Trust transactions are strictly APCs only. Reporting period Oct 2013-July 2014 (partial year)
Library Fund	Criteria for fund: fully OA journals only, where author has no other source of funds. Reporting period Aug 2013-July2014
Average APCs	APC amounts taken directly from worksheets, so includes discounted amounts etc as described above

2013-14 RCUK

Funder name	Journal title / publication	Hybrid/ Fully OA	Publisher	APC	Licence	DOI	Comments
EPSRC	Optics Express	Fully OA	The Optical Society (OSA)	£695.97	© held by publisher	10.1364/OE.21.014362	Marked as 'free', © OSA
BBSRC	Hippocampus	Hybrid	Wiley	£1,500.00	CC-BY	10.1002/hipo.22165	CC-BY not implemented until 2014
EPSRC	Advanced Optical Materials	Hybrid	Wiley	£1,500.00	CC-BY	10.1002/adom.201300211	
EPSRC	Nature Communications	Hybrid	Nature Publishing Group	£3,780.00	CC-BY	10.1038/ncomms3374	
EPSRC	CrystEngComm	Hybrid	Royal Society of Chemistry	£1,600.00	CC-BY	10.1039/C3CE40965A	
BBSRC	Molecular Biology and Evolution	Hybrid	Oxford University Press	£1,740.00	CC-BY-NC	10.1093/molbev/mst102	Non-compliant licence
BBSRC	Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B	Hybrid	Royal Society	£1,620.00	CC-BY	10.1098/rstb.2012.0415	Includes colour charge of £300

NERC	Gondwana Research	Hybrid	Elsevier	£1,700.00	CC-BY	10.1016/j.gr.2013.07.002	Nominal amount - included in prepay scheme
EPSRC	Angewandte Chemie	Hybrid	Wiley	£1,500.00	CC-BY	10.1002/anie.201306786	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
EPSRC	Nature Communications	Hybrid	NPG	£3,780.00	CC-BY	10.1038/ncomms3867	
NERC	Proceedings of the Royal Society B	Hybrid	Royal Society	£1,260.00	CC-BY	10.1098/rspb.2013.2194	
BBSRC	Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - General	Hybrid	Elsevier	£1,576.29	CC-BY	10.1016/j.bbagen.2013.05.028	Not in prepay scheme
NERC	Journal of Quaternary Science	Hybrid	Wiley	£1,500.00	CC-BY	10.1002/jqs.2666	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
NERC	PNAS	Hybrid	National Academy of Sciences	£649.45	Unknown	10.1073/pnas.1302295110	No licence given
BBSRC	Angewandte Chemie	Hybrid	Wiley	£2,250.00	CC-BY	10.1002/anie.201306302	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
BBSRC	Biology Letters	Hybrid	Royal Society	£1,260.00	CC-BY	10.1098/rsbl.2013.0687	
BBSRC	Nucleic Acids Research	Fully OA	Oxford University Press	£852.00	CC-BY	10.1093/nar/gkt1116	Discounted APC
ESRC	Advances in Life Course Research	Hybrid	Elsevier	£850.00	CC-BY	10.1016/j.alcr.2013.11.004	Nominal amount - included in prepay scheme
BBSRC	Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Molecular Science	Hybrid	Wiley	£1,500.00	CC-BY	10.1002/wcms.1183	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
EPSRC	Journal of Vision	Fully OA	ARVO	£735.85	© held by publisher	10.1167/14.3.5	Optional page charges not included
EPSRC	Advanced Optical Materials	Hybrid	Wiley	£1,500.00	CC-BY	10.1002/adom.201300441	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
MRC	Statistics in Medicine	Hybrid	Wiley	£1,500.00	CC-BY	10.1002/sim.6047	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
EPSRC	Journal of Organic Chemistry	Hybrid	American Chemical Society	£939.50	CC-BY	10.1021/jo4027929	CC-BY not implemented until Jul 2014
MRC	Statistical Methodology	Hybrid	Elsevier	£1,200.00	CC-BY	10.1016/j.stamet.2013.08.007	Nominal amount - included in prepay scheme

NERC	Journal of Neuroscience Methods	Hybrid	Elsevier	£1,000.00	CC-BY	10.1016/j.jneumeth.2014.01.019	Nominal amount - included in prepay scheme
EPSRC	Chemical Physics Letters	Hybrid	Elsevier	£1,500.00	CC-BY	10.1016/j.cplett.2013.08.098	Nominal amount - included in prepay scheme
NERC	Quaternary Science Reviews	Hybrid	Elsevier	£1,100.00	CC-BY	10.1016/j.quascirev.2014.02.001	Nominal amount - included in prepay scheme
EPSRC	Chemistry - A European Journal	Hybrid	Wiley	£1,875.00	CC-BY	10.1002/chem.201304929	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
EPSRC	Optics Express	Fully OA	The Optical Society (OSA)	£681.79	© held by publisher	10.1364/OE.22.001667	Marked as 'free', © OSA
NERC	Boreas	Hybrid	Wiley	£1,500.00	CC-BY	10.1111/bor.12078	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
BBSRC	Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling	Hybrid	American Chemical Society	£1,336.09	CC-BY	10.1021/ci4005805	Includes ACS author membership to enable discount. CC-BY not implemented until Jul 2014
EPSRC	Journal of the American Statistical Association	Hybrid	Taylor & Francis	£2,158.54	n/a	10.1080/01621459.2014.893884	Not yet published
NERC	Geology	Hybrid	Geological Society of America	£1,829.27	CC-BY	10.1130/G35402.1	
EPSRC	Accounts of Chemical Research	Hybrid	American Chemical Society	£1,226.76	CC-BY	10.1021/ar500017f	Includes ACS author membership to enable discount. CC-BY not implemented until Jul 2014
EPSRC	ZAAC/Journal of Inorganic and General Chemistry	Hybrid	Wiley	£1,500.00	CC-BY	10.1002/zaac.201400103	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
NERC	Evolution	Hybrid	Wiley	£1,500.00	CC-BY	10.1111/evo.12401	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
BBSRC	Proceedings of the Royal Society B	Hybrid	Royal Society	£1,260.00	CC-BY	10.1098/rspb.2013.3225	
EPSRC	Journal of Algebra	Hybrid	Elsevier	£1,000.00	CC-BY	10.1016/j.jalgebra.2014.03.010	Nominal amount - included in prepay scheme
BBSRC	Nucleic Acids Research	Fully OA	Oxford University Press	£852.00	CC-BY	10.1093/nar/gku308	
BBSRC	Behavioural Brain Research	Hybrid	Elsevier	£2,200.00	CC-BY	10.1016/j.bbr.2014.01.043	Nominal amount - included in prepay scheme

EPSRC	Artificial Intelligence	Hybrid	Elsevier	£1,000.00	CC-BY	10.1016/j.artint.2014.03.001	Nominal amount - included in prepay scheme
NERC	Ecology & Evolution	Fully OA	Wiley	£971.00	CC-BY	10.1002/ece3.1098	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
EPSRC	Journal of the American Chemical Society	Hybrid	American Chemical Society	£1,228.22	CC-BY	10.1021/ja502625z	Includes ACS author membership to enable discount. CC-BY not implemented until Jul 2014
BBSRC	PLoS Computational Biology	Fully OA	PLOS	£1,247.53	CC-BY	10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003642	
EPSRC	e-Energy '14: Proceedings...	Hybrid	ACM	£800.00	© held by publisher	10.1145/2602044.2602063	Not yet made OA by publisher
EPSRC	Angewandte Chemie	Hybrid	Wiley	£2,250.00	CC-BY	10.1002/ange.201400600	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
NERC	Water Resources Research	Hybrid	Wiley	£1,875.00	CC-BY	10.1002/2014WR015581	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
NERC	Proceedings of the Royal Society B	Hybrid	Royal Society	£1,260.00	n/a	n/a	Not yet published, invoice not yet processed
NERC	Biological Reviews	Hybrid	Wiley	£1,500.00	© publisher and author	10.1111/brv.12126	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme. CC licence not applied
ESRC	Global Environmental Change	Hybrid	Elsevier	£1,700.00	CC-BY	10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.01.009	Nominal amount - included in prepay scheme. CC licence not applied to pdf, ©Elsevier incorrectly stated on article
NERC	Paleoceanography	Hybrid	Wiley	£1,875.00	CC-BY-NC-ND	10.1002/2013PA002570	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme. Incorrect licence selected
BBSRC	Proceedings of the Royal Society B	Hybrid	Royal Society	£1,260.00	CC-BY	10.1098/rspb.2014.0579	
EPSRC	Langmuir	Hybrid	American Chemical Society	£1,223.70	CC-BY	10.1021/la5011727	
NERC	Animal Behaviour	Hybrid	Elsevier	£1,294.00	CC-BY	10.1016/j.anbehav.2014.03.019	Nominal amount - included in prepay scheme
EPSRC	Journal of Organometallic Chemistry	Hybrid	Elsevier	£0.00	© held by publisher	10.1016/j.jorganchem.2014.04.022	Requested - not yet OA
EPSRC	Polyhedron	Hybrid	Elsevier	£1,522.00	CC-BY	10.1016/j.poly.2014.06.017	Nominal amount - included in prepay scheme. In press, awaiting final pdf

EPSRC	Journal of Solid State Chemistry	Hybrid	Elsevier	£1,500.00	CC-BY	10.1016/j.jssc.2014.03.008	Nominal amount - included in prepay scheme. CC licence not applied to pdf, ©Elsevier incorrectly stated on article
NERC	Evolutionary Ecology	Hybrid	Springer	£1,788.62	n/a	n/a	Not yet published
NERC	Quaternary Science Reviews	Hybrid	Elsevier	£1,450.00	CC-BY	10.1016/j.quascirev.2013.12.021	Nominal amount - included in prepay scheme. CC licence not applied to pdf, ©Elsevier incorrectly stated on article
NERC	Geological Society of America Bulletin	Hybrid	GSA	£1,488.10	n/a	n/a	Not yet published
MRC	PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases	Fully OA	PLOS	£803.56	CC-BY	10.1371/journal.pntd.0003086	50% paid by Wellcome Trust
BBSRC	BMC Bioinformatics	Fully OA	Biomed Central	£1,393.20	CC-BY	10.1186/1471-2105-14-243	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
MRC	BMC Biotechnology	Fully OA	Biomed Central	£1,393.00	CC-BY	10.1186/1472-6750-13-67	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
MRC	Malaria Journal	Fully OA	Biomed Central	£1,572.00	CC-BY	10.1186/1475-2875-11-363	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
NERC	BMC Ecology	Fully OA	Biomed Central	£1,431.00	CC-BY	10.1186/1472-6785-14-18	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
NERC	BMC Plant Biology	Fully OA	Biomed Central	£1,431.00	CC-BY	10.1186/1471-2229-14-139	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
BBSRC	BMC Bioinformatics	Fully OA	Biomed Central	£1,431.00	CC-BY	10.1186/1471-2105-15-150	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
EPSRC	Chemical Communications	Hybrid	Royal Society of Chemistry	£0.00	CC-BY	10.1039/C3CC45545A	Gold 4 Gold - free APC
EPSRC	Chemical Science	Hybrid	Royal Society of Chemistry	£0.00	CC-BY	10.1039/C3SC52612G	Gold 4 Gold - free APC
EPSRC	CrystEngComm	Hybrid	Royal Society of Chemistry	£0.00	CC-BY	10.1039/C3CE41422A	Gold 4 Gold - free APC
EPSRC	Journal of Materials Chemistry A	Hybrid	Royal Society of Chemistry	£0.00	CC-BY	10.1039/C3TA12860A	Gold 4 Gold - free APC
EPSRC	Chemical Communications	Hybrid	Royal Society of Chemistry	£1,400.00	CC-BY	10.1039/C4CC02515F	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
EPSRC	Chemical Communications	Hybrid	Royal Society of Chemistry	£1,400.00	CC-BY	10.1039/C4CC03650F	Discounted APC as part of prepay scheme
EPSRC	Chemical Science	Hybrid	Royal Society of Chemistry	£0.00	CC-BY	0.1039/C4SC00879K	Gold 4 Gold - free APC

2013-14 Wellcome Trust

Journal title / publication	Hybrid / Fully OA	Publisher	APC	Licence	DOI	PMC ID	PMID	Comments
Lancet Respiratory Medicine	Hybrid	Elsevier	£3,155.05	CC-BY	10.1016/S2213-2600(13)70231-5	PMC3861685		
Journal of Virology	Hybrid	American Society for Microbiology	£1,898.73	CC-BY	10.1128/JVI.02220-13	PMC3838145		
Cellular Microbiology	Hybrid	Wiley	£1,500.00	CC-BY	10.1111/cmi.12240	-	PMID:24245785	
Journal of Neurophysiology	Hybrid	American Physiological Society	£1,463.41	CC-BY	10.1152/jn.00378.2013	PMC3921400	-	
PLoS ONE	Fully OA	PLoS	£425.46	CC-BY	10.1371/journal.pone.0085386	PMC3904843	-	Split payment 50%
BMC Medical Research Methodology	Fully OA	BioMed Central	£1,431.00	CC-BY	10.1186/1471-2288-14-59	PMC4021181	-	
Molecular Microbiology	Hybrid	Wiley	£1,500.00	CC-BY	10.1111/mmi.12553	-	PMID:24533860	
Blood	Hybrid	American Society of Hematology	£601.00	(c) held by publisher	10.1182/blood-2013-11-535963	PMC3962167	-	Split payment 50%
Journal of Virology	Hybrid	American Society for Microbiology	£1,238.87	CC-BY	10.1128/JVI.00014-14	PMC3993829	-	
Journal of Neuroscience	Hybrid	Society for Neuroscience	£1,941.00	CC-BY	10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4198-13.2014	PMC3996224	-	
Journal of Medicinal Chemistry	Hybrid	American Chemical Society	£1,454.55	CC-BY	10.1021/jm500361r	PMC4099174	-	
Journal of Cell Science	Hybrid	Company of Biologists	£3,000.00	CC-BY	10.1242/jcs.150425	-	PMID:24794494	
PLoS ONE	Fully OA	PLoS	£830.39	CC-BY	10.1371/journal.pone.0099874	-	PMID:24950212	
PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases	Fully OA	PLoS	£803.58	CC-BY	10.1371/journal.pntd.0003086	n/a	-	Split payment 50%

2013-14 Library Fund

Journal title / publication	Hybrid / Fully OA	Publisher	APC	Licence	DOI	Comments
Frontiers in Psychology	Fully OA	Frontiers	£1,400.00	CC-BY	10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00881	
PLoS ONE	Fully OA	PLoS	£804.24	CC-BY	10.1371/journal.pone.0074295	
PLoS ONE	Fully OA	PLoS	£860.00	CC-BY	10.1371/journal.pone.0080727	
Sensors	Fully OA	MDPI	£902.00	CC-BY	10.3390/s140202822	Split payment 75% paid
PLoS ONE	Fully OA	PLoS	£860.00	CC-BY	10.1371/journal.pone.0080957	
Frontiers in Microbiology	Fully OA	Frontiers	£731.30	CC-BY	10.3389/fmicb.2014.00123	
PLoS ONE	Fully OA	PLoS	£815.38	CC-BY	10.1371/journal.pone.0100966	
PLoS ONE	Fully OA	PLoS	£815.52	CC-BY	10.1371/journal.pone.0103777	

Average APCs

RCUK APCs	Count of Hybrid / Fully OA	Average of APC
Fully OA	14	£1,106.49
Hybrid	60	£1,415.35
Grand Total	74	£1,356.12
WELLCOME APCs	Count of Hybrid / Fully OA	Average of APC
Fully OA	4	£872.61
Hybrid	10	£1,775.26
Grand Total	14	£1,517.36
LIBRARY APCs	Count of Hybrid / Fully OA	Average of APC
Fully OA	8	£898.56
Grand Total	8	£898.56

Appendix C: Gold: examples of issues with APCs

We have made detailed article level compliance data available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1150253> and in this document as Appendix B.

In addition we provide here some particular examples of item-level information which inform compliance monitoring with regard to Gold OA and additional charges over and above APCs, for example page charges, licence charges and bank charges. Also some details of notable complex publisher payment processes and options for Gold transactions.

Instances where additional charges have been made

Funder	Publisher	APC	DOI	Additional charges
BBSRC	Royal Society	£1,620	10.1098/rstb.2012.0415	Includes colour charge of £300
EPSRC	ACS	£1240	10.1021/ci4005805 10.1021/ar500017f 10.1021/ja502625z 10.1021/jo4027929	Includes \$500 (discounted charge) for CC-BY, and author membership (\$154) which enables 50% discount.
RCUK	Jisc APC	n/a	n/a	Bank charges of £12 for foreign currency deposits
NERC	Geological Society of America	£1829	10.1130/G35402.1	Additional bank charge of £12 for USD payment
NERC	Geological Society of America	£5353	Not yet published	Includes \$6225 for page and colour charges

Publisher payment processes and options

Funder	Publisher	APC	DOI	Issue
EPSRC	ACS	£1240	Multiple	Difficulty tracking and matching payments
EPSRC	Association for	£800	10.1145/2602044.26	Difficulty supplying multiple

	Computing Machinery		02063	references through banking system. ACM unable to match payment despite repeated emails
EPSRC	Taylor & Francis	£2158	n/a	Payment made in June 2014, article not yet published
EPSRC	Association for Research in Vision and Ophthalmology	£736	10.1167/14.3.5	Must be paid by credit card online, must decline 'optional' page charges
NERC	Geological Society of America	£1829	10.1130/G35402.1	Difficulty tracking and matching payments

The most problematic publisher we encountered while administering and supporting Gold OA transaction for the policy was the American Chemical Society. Initially the transaction process began with paper forms that had to be faxed. It then moved to manual invoices that could be paid by Purchase Order, and it then moved once more, this time to online RightsLink processing which assumes the author pays via their own individual login. The author must choose from multiple, confusing options – eight different payment rates, each of which has an additional charge for CC licences (2 further options). This results in 16 permutations in all! <http://acsopenaccess.org/acs-authorchoice/>

There are particular difficulties in administering publisher-specific schemes for RCUK-funded researchers only. These schemes are set up and funded by RCUK block grant funds by an arrangement between the OA administrators in the institution and the publishers. But on publisher websites and during interactions between authors and publishers they tend to be described as an 'institutional' membership. This leads non-funded researchers to believe that there is an institutional scheme that they can use and is misleading. Communicating the criteria for use of these schemes is therefore difficult and can lead to confusion by researchers. If an institution does have other OA funds - for example for Wellcome or an institutional fund - then the picture becomes even more complex. So although it is understood that RCUK block grants need to be ring-fenced for RCUK research, it would be useful to explore how funds might be less rigid. This would give an easier message for researchers, may avoid complicated internal movement of funds, and remove a high administrative burden on institutional OA teams. It could also encourage publisher sites and information to be easier to understand and interpret.

Appendix D: Compliant journals

We are unable to report on papers published in *non-compliant journals*.

Health warning: Papers that have not been made OA through either route could be published in compliant or non-compliant journals - the lack of an OA version does not provide evidence of *journal* compliance. Tools such as our Sherpa/Romeo API cannot provide compliance information at the journals level, and each journal would need to be checked individually with complex criteria in mind to be sure. With regard to the 82 papers that were not made OA, this is not necessarily because of non-compliance in terms of author journal choices or journal OA policies. It is likely mostly to be due to authors not sufficiently engaging with the policy, or not taking advantage of our support, to be compliant, and not following through with OA actions (as in the example of Green OA not being achieved because the appropriate final author version is not available to satisfy publisher policies). Authors may still be intending to deposit author versions for recently published outputs where an embargo has not yet expired, and we cannot report on this in advance.

There could also be cases in the papers reported for both Gold and Green where the journal is not strictly compliant with the policy. Examples of non-compliant licences are shown below, and issues with embargo periods in Appendix E.

Non-compliant licences

Funder	Publisher	APC	DOI	Licence	Comments
EPSRC	The Optical Society (OSA)	£695	10.1364/OE.21.014362	Copyright held by publisher	Free, © OSA
BBSRC	Oxford University Press	£1,740	10.1093/molbev/mst102	CC-BY-NC	Non-compliant licence
NERC	National Academy of Sciences	£649	10.1073/pnas.1302295110	Unknown	No licence given
EPSRC	Association for Research in Vision and Ophthalmology	£735	10.1167/14.3.5	Copyright held by publisher	No licence given
EPSRC	The Optical Society (OSA)	£681	10.1364/OE.22.001667	Copyright held by publisher	Free, © OSA

EPSRC	Association for Computing Machinery	£800	10.1145/260204 4.2602063	Copyright held by publisher	Not made OA by publisher
NERC	Wiley	£1,500	10.1111/brv.121 26	Copyright held by publisher and author	CC licence not applied
NERC	Wiley	£1,875	10.1002/2013PA 002570	CC-BY-NC-ND	Incorrect licence selected

Appendix E: Examples of issues with embargoes

Elsevier has multiple, journal-specific embargoes which are different depending on funder and/or mandate in place. These include two journal-specific lists where ‘mandates’ apply –

1. http://www.elsevier.com/_data/assets/pdf_file/0018/121293/external-embargo-list.pdf and
2. http://www.elsevier.com/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/154786/EmbargoPeriods_2.PDF.

In one particular journal (*Tetrahedron*) a non-funded paper could be deposited (voluntarily) immediately; an RCUK-funded paper could be deposited with a 12-month embargo; and an EU-mandated paper with 24-month embargo. A final permutation for a Wellcome funded paper was that only PMC deposit would be allowed with Gold OA.

Wiley’s embargo policy in 2013 for non-funded papers stated that the deposit of the Accepted Manuscript was not allowed under Copyright Transfer Agreement, but the deposit of the Accepted Manuscript for RCUK-funded papers was allowed with embargoes. This was then effectively the opposite of the Elsevier policy. This sort of contradiction across publisher policies makes it very difficult to give a clear message to authors when supporting them in making their publications OA.

In general, Green policies are not communicated from publishers to authors or made readily accessible on publisher websites when authors are using publisher sites to choose OA options. In direct contrast information about Gold options is promoted on publisher pages.

Embargo issues

Funder	Publisher	DOI	Embargo / Policy	Comments
BBSRC, Royal Society and British Academy	Elsevier	10.1016/j.beproc.2014.04.013	12 months or 18 months	Difficult to establish embargo period as 2 lists exist, depending on funder – see section 3.2 below
NERC	American Physiological Society	10.1152/ajpregu.00044.2013	Posting of accepted manuscript not allowed	APS require paid option. (Article was submitted prior to RCUK policy)